

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 6792
10/005,213	12/04/2001	Michael T. Tessmer	29757/AG54	
4743	7590 07/14/2006	EXAMINER KIM, ANDREW		
	L, GERSTEIN & BOF			
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER		00	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,	IL 60606		3712	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/005,213	TESSMER ET AL.		
Examiner		Art Unit		
	Andrew Kim	3712		

	Andrew Kim		3712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cove	r sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 June 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day a ving replies: (1) a tice of Appeal (v	s filing a Notice of an amendment, af vith appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	dvisory Action, or ater than SIX MON (b). ONLY CHECK	(2) the date set forth ITHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the co shortened statutory than three month	rresponding amount period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37	7 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/			ecause
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beauppeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a 		•		the issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		d Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 91, 92, 94-114, 117-122. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reas	ons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> reje y and was not e	ections under appearlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or I	PRIMARY E	No(s) CHALING, II EXAMINER	
			/	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 11 of the remarks, Applicants assert that the limitation receiving a request from the player to initiate a selection are not disclosed taught or suggested in Cannon. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees in view of col. 8, lines 17-67 of Cannon which states, "When the time for exhibition of the feature event has arrived, any players currently qualified for feature event participation may be queried through a dialog box...as to whether they wish to participate in the next feature event." When the player chooses to enter an event in combination with a wager, the player is consequently requesting a selection.

Applicants further assert that the canceling feature is not disclosed in Cannon. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees because canceling an entry placed by a player if the entry is not a winner is inherent. Otherwise, every player with an entry would win and there would not be any losers. Furthermore, the canceling feature may be considered in the alternative which would require only the awarding feature to be rejected.

Applicants also believe that there is no provision for a player in Cannon to accelerate the allegedly corresponding feature event or provide for the utilization of the entries without waiting, at the player's request. However, Examiner respectfully requests Applicants to indicate where in the claimed subject matter is the player accelerating the feature event without waiting. Examiner interprets claim 91 as indicating that the player requested function is that of initiating a selection of an entry and NOT of initiating a feature event.

Applicants assert that the request to initiate the selection is recited seperately from qualifying and placing the entries. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees because the secondary wager of Cannon is not related to the qualifying action as shown in fig. 4 of Cannon. Further, the claimed permitting feature has been interpreted as simply the opportunity for the player to place an entry. The actual entry placing action occurs in claimed receiving a request feature and therefore "requesting to initiate the selection" is NOT recited seperately from placing the entries.

